

POST-TRIBUNE
EVENING 10,389

Zeroing In on the Military Gap

The Pentagon apparently is having some second thoughts over its own indoctrination program. The program, which has been in effect since 1954, is designed to instill in the minds of military personnel a deep understanding of the nature and goals of communism. The program is based on the premise that the military must be prepared to fight a "No-Win" war against the Red menace. The program is designed to be a "No-Win" war, which means that the military must be prepared to fight a war in which the odds are against them. The program is designed to be a "No-Win" war, which means that the military must be prepared to fight a war in which the odds are against them.

But the announcement together with another one by a Defense Department official last week suggests the Pentagon is worried over a Senate subcommittee airing of the overall issue soon.

McNamara says a special committee is being created to assess present troop indoctrination programs. Committee members will include Allen W. Dulles, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, former chief of naval operations; and 11 other civic leaders from business, education and retired military ranks.

Why, Americans might ask, is the Pentagon announcing a study into this matter almost on the eve of a Senate preparedness subcommittee's opening of hearings into this and related issues?

Sen. Strom Thurmond (D-S.C.), who led the Senate fight which led to authorization of hearings beginning Jan. 23, cannot be blamed for issuing a critical statement. The Pentagon announcement hardly can be considered coincidental.

The South Carolina senator, we believe, pinpoints the Pentagon action as an admission of shortcomings within the existing troop indoctrination program. Here's what he has to say:

"In view of the forthcoming investigation—the facts for which have already been assembled for the most part—I am not surprised that the Defense Department now proposes to establish a study committee. I sincerely hope that the committee's action will result in improvements which have been vitally needed for some time. A study committee is, of course, a standard bureaucratic response to publicized revelations of shortcomings."

Sen. Thurmond gives an insight into these Pentagon shortcomings and others in a series of eight articles which will appear in the News-Tribune publications beginning today. We commend them to our readers.

The hearings, as the senator suggests, will be among the "most vital" undertaken on Capitol Hill in some time. The purpose, he points out, is not to promote a "No-Win" war, but to promote a "No-Win" war.

which worked so well in the Korean War "because our troops were ill-prepared" and for discouraging the use of military personnel and facilities in Cold War seminars. The latter, authorized in a 1955 National Security Council directive, were designed to give the public a fuller understanding of diabolical communism.

The South Carolina senator says his study of present Pentagon policies relating to communism convinces him that "they have a deep underlying purpose which has not been readily apparent to the American public." This purpose, he adds, is to combat communism with a strategy which can best be defined as a "No-Win" policy.

This "No-Win" policy is reflected in a number of ways.

One, as Sen. Thurmond suggests, is the determination of some in America to join the professed revolution of Communists "by adopting for ourselves and many of our Allies the same social and economic measures" which the Reds use as bait to attain their goal of world domination.

Another is the pointless censorship of some remarks by military leaders.

When one military man included the fact that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev had banged his shoe on the table in the United Nations General Assembly, the item was blue-penciled. The censor also ruled out the Communist boss's oft-quoted remark, "We will bury you," and penciled in: "He has denied that he meant this literally."

It is tragic, by the way, that we have such naive people in Washington.

As the senator explains, some censorship may be necessary. Security requirements may demand it on occasion. But even here it should not be overly excessive. And it is also necessary for military leaders to refrain from speaking in official statements contrary to established foreign policy. But we object with Sen. Thurmond that "foreign policy" should not be so broadly interpreted as to create a code of silence. And military personnel must have access to political matters on a broad scope. How can they be expected to do otherwise?